87-1463

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 30 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October, 1987 Term

CHARLES W. BROWN,
"Unenfranchised Citizen of Texas"
Appellant,

VS.

BROWN AND ROOT U.S.A. INC,
CECIL SHEPHARD, PAT BLACKBURN,
WILLIAM L. BEDMAN. JAMES E. YOUNG,
JOHN AND JANE DOE'S 1 - 99
APPELLEES.

On Appeal from the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

CHARLES W. BROWN
6th Judicial District
10922 Muscatine
Houston, Texas
(713) 455-4709

Appellant in Pro Per

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1) Does the Corporation Brown & Root, acting under the authority of the Corporate entity, called the State of Texas, have the lawful authority to require a sovereign to obtain a permission from them as a privilege in order to make a living?

2) Does appellant have standing to claim the absolute protection of the prohibitions (Article I, section 10) of the United States Constitution against state statutory law made or administered in violation thereof?

3) Did the trial court violate the appellants VII Amendment right by dismissing his complaint without any kind of a hearing?

4) Does the Texas Social Security Agreement violate prohibitions of the United States Constitution, when applied to one who retains his inalienable rights of

liberty (right to work 5th Amend.) and (religious belief under the 1st Amend.) i.e., one who refuses to voluntarily acquiesce to the power exercised through this legislation?

5) Did the trial court show acts of prejudice, when it refused to make service on the Appellees et al, when in fact the appellant did raise serious matters to the court, as the lower Appellate court averred to in its opinion?

6) Is this the only court that, the common law jurisdiction of Article III of the Constitution for the U.S. of America can be invoked?

7) Why does the Appellant or any other **unenfranchised** citizen have to go through all of this to obtain his **natural indefeasible** right to work and earn a living?

8) The Appellant being a free white common law citizen of the Union pursuant to the mandate of the Preamble, can Appellant be constitutionally denied a judicial trial and be subjected instead to a legislative procedure in a legislative tribunal? And as a result suffer without benefit of a hearing, a jury or a trial? Can the Appellant be systematically deprived of all redress and simultaneously be considered to have received justice and the benefit of "due process" as known to the common law?

LIST OF THE PARTIES

The following persons were named as parties in Cause No. H-86-3247, filed in the District Court of the United States, Southern District of Texas, Houstion Division:

1) Charles W. Brown; Plaintiff

2) BROWN & ROOT U.S.A. INC.

3) WILLIAM L. BEDMAN

4) JAMES E. YOUNG

5) CECIL SHEPHARD

6) PAT BLACKBURN; Defendants

In addition to the above named Defendants Judge, Norman W. Black, who is named as Respondent herein have an interest in this case and have been served with (3) copies of this instant Jurisdictional Statement. There may be other parties of interest to this case that I am not aware of.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... i, ii, iii

LIST OF PARTIES..... iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... v

OPINION BELOW..... vi

GROUNDS FOR INVOKING JURISDICTION..... 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 14

WHY QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE SO SUBSTANTIAL AS TO REQUIRE PLENARY CONSIDERATION..... 14

CONCLUSION..... 19

APPENDIX:

Order dismissing complaint..... App-1

Order denying motion to compel and
motion for relief from judgment.... App-2

Notice of Appeal from Dis. Court.... App-3

Order dismissing Appeal..... App-4

Order denying rehearing..... App-5

Notice of Appeal..... App-6

Order of State Dis. Court..... App-7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Crandell -vs- Connecticut.
10 Conn. Rep. 340 (1834)..... 8

Dred Scott -vs- Sandford.
19 How 393 (1857)..... 4,8,13

Van Valkenburg -vs- Brown.
43 Cal S. Ct. 43 (1872)..... 13

US Const. Preamble..... 3,4,7,12

US Const. Art I Sec. 10..... 3,5,6,7

US Const. Art III Sec. 1..... 2,6

US Const. Art III Sec. 2..... 9

US Const. Art IV Sec. 2..... 7,8

US Const. Art VI cl 2..... 9

US Const. Amend 9..... 10

US Const. Amend 10..... 10.11

US CONST. Amend 13..... 11.12.13.17

US Const. Amend 14..... 12.17

Const Preambles..... 3.4.7.12

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

28 USC sec 1252 (1)..... 2.8

OPINIONS AND ORDERS IN THE COURT BELOW

Appendix 1: (Trial Court)

The court having found. that Plaintiff's complaint in forma pauperis is frivolous. that action is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

This is a FINAL JUDGMENT.

Done at Houston. Texas. this 18th day of November. 1986.

Norman W. Black
United States District Judge

Appendix 2: (Trial Court)

Plaintiff's motion to compel and motion for amendment and relief from judgment are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Done at Houston, Texas, this 23rd day of January, 1987.

Norman W. Black
United States District Judge

Appendix 3: (Notice of Appeal to Fifth Circuit)

Appendix 4: (Cause No. 87-2139

"Though appellant discusses serious matters, he states no legal claim for this Court. It is therefore Dismissed."

Appendix 5: (Order denying Petition for rehearing)

Appendix 6: (Notice of Appeal to Supreme Court, United States) Receipt was acknowledged on December 14th, 1987

Appendix 7: (Order of the State Court declaring citizenship)

GROUNDS FOR INVOKING JURISDICTION

Nature of Proceeding:

This is a Civil case, instituted in law, wherein the appellant Charles W. Brown, filed his complaint in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division cause no. (H-86-3247) was dismissed with prejudice, as frivolous. (App-1)

The Appellant filed Motion for relief from judgment on the 1st day of December, 1986. The District Court denied same on the 23rd day of January, 1987 (App-2) the appellant gave notice of Appeal as a matter of right on the 6th day of February, 1987, (App-3) appellant filed motion for a free, white, Christian male court and his Appeal Brief on the 20th day of October, 1987, the Appeals court (5th cr.) dismissed appellants appeal on the 6th day of November, 1987 (App-4) within its opinion the courts said: "though

appellant discusses serious matters, he states no legal claim for this court", the Appeals Court (5th Cr.) never made reference to the appellants motion for a free, white, Christian male Court.

The appellant filed petition for rehearing on the 16th day of October, 1987, the petition was denied on the 23rd day of November, 1987 (App-5) the Appellant gave notice of Appeal on the 8th day of December, 1987. (App-6)

Statutory Provisions

Appellant depends upon 28 USC Sec. 1252 to invoke the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court as provided in Article III of the United States Constitution.

In this case, the decision of the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals refusing to rehear the appellants petition for rehearing, is final.

Although a "decision could be had" the Appeals court (5th Cir.) dismissed the appeal, even though, the Appeals Court (5th Cr.) stated that, the appellant raised serious matters to the court, the appellant states no legal claim for this court, there fore, leaving the appellant no choice except to appeal his case to the most highest authority in these United States of America.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America plays a part in this action. In this appeal the question of whether the appellant has standing to claim the absolute protections of the prohibitions of Article I, section 10, United States Constitution, against a state law made in violation thereof is involved (e.g., whether the appellant had proper standing in the trial court to claim such protections as affirmative

assertions to support his claim.

The words of the Preamble are clear and pervade the Constitution in its entirety, revealing its true intent and purpose. As well, the Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America establishes for whose protection the provisions of the Constitution were originally adopted. Dred Scott -vs- Sandford, 19 How (60 US) 393, 410.

> "We the people of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to our selves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." (Preamble, U.S. Const.)

Appellant is of the class of citizen contemplated by the Preamble, which is evidenced in the trial court as well, as in the Appeals Court (5 Cr.), by an Order from the 157 Judicial District Court of Harris County, the State of Texas signed

by the presiding judge and declaring the Appellants - citizenship as stated supra, and not a class emanating from or through the 14th Amendment. (App-7)

In the trial court as well as the Appeals Court (5th Cr.), the appellant raised certain prohibitions of the Constitution for the United States as grounds for his cause of action against the Appellees et al. Appellant alleges that these statutes are either made or administered in violation of these prohibitions of the Constitution for the United States of America.

The relevant portions of Article I, section 10 raised by appellant as assertions of fact enjoin the state of Texas or its agencies (Social Security) and subdivisions (Corporations) as follows:

"No state shall...; pass any Bill of Attainder,... or Law impairing the Obligations of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility." (Art I Sec 10 Cl 1, US Const.)

The Appellees has violated these prohibitions of the United States Constitution under the authority of the State of Texas either in passage of the state legislation or in application of the state legislation to appellant, and said violation is the basis of the appellants unlawful termination where the appellant was working, thus the judgment of the trial court should be held for naught, because the trial court was not a common law court acting under the authority of Article III, the proceedings conducted in the trial court were of a admiralty/-maritime jurisdiction under the authority of Article I, it was a legislative court not a judicial court.

Not only will the court find a question of comity between state and federal law

in this case, but the Texas Constitution will play an intricate part in determining whether the prohibitions of Article I sec. 10, United States Constitution have been violated by the state of Texas and/or its agencies. When applied to the status of the appellant or any other common law citizen.

If this court agrees that state legislation, on its face is a Bill of Attainder (in its lesser form, a Bill of Pains and Penalties), whether or not the legislation (Social Security) is constitutionally applicable to appellant will turn on the standing of appellant to claim the protections of Article I sec 10, United States Constitution. This in turn draws into question the Preambles of the United States and Texas' Constitution, (1836) and will further draw into question the applicability of Article IV, Sec. 2, Cl. 1, United States Constitution.

Appellant was initially a citizen of the state of Arkansas, being born therein, and having removed himself to Texas. In pertinent part, Article IV, United States Constitution provides the following protections to appellant to sustain appellant's claim that rights of citizenship are secured by the original Texas Constitution.

"The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of Citizens in the several States." Article IV, Sec. 2, Cl. 1, U.S. Const.

It should be noticed that rights secured by Article IV, section 2, United States Constitution depend upon the constitution of the state involved for determination. Dred Scott -vs- Sandford, supra, 19 How at 422-423; Chandell -vs- Connecticut, 10 Conn. Re. p. 340, 343-344 (1834).

As can be seen from 28 USC Sec. 1252 (1) the Congress of the United States has placed no limitations on the appellate

jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court in respect to the aforementioned constitutional questions, and this court is free to exercise jurisdiction conferred by the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

> "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court..." Article III, Sec. 2 Cl. 1, U.S. Const.

> "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution,...." Article III Sec. 2, Cl. 1, U.S. Const.

> "...In all other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions as the Congress shall make." Art. III, Sec. 2, Cl. 2, U.S. Const.

Where one state statute, or several state statutes enforced or operating in conjunction, violate the prohibitions of the United States Constitution the supremacy clause makes the law of the state and judgments made thereunder void.

> "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties

made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land: and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitutions or Laws of any States to the Contrary notwithstanding."
Article VI, Cl. 2, U.S. Const.

The 9th Article of the Bill of Rights shows that the rights violated by the state by enactments prohibited in the United States Constitution need not be specifically enumerated in the United States Constitution to exist.

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." Art. 9, Bill of Rights U.S. Const.

The 10th Article of the Bill of Rights is an extension and restatement of the injunction placed upon the state by the prohibitions of Article I, Section 10, United States Constitution.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States respectively, or to the people." Art. 10 Bill of Rights U.S. Const.

Also the 10th Amendment makes reference to power retained by the people themselves and will have relation to the Texas

constitution with respect to powers given the government of Texas by its citizens and those powers of Texas (in Article I, Texas Constitution). Appellant possesses these secured rights as one of "the people respectively".

As the 10th Amendment, United States Constitution declares where the respective power of the people lies, and as the 9th Amendment secures rights not specifically enumerated in the United States Constitution, these provisions must be considered in determining the comity between the power of the Texas state government and the rights of appellant (a Texas citizen).

It is specifically noted that this appeal is outside the purview of the 13th and subsequent Amendments. Appellant is not a citizen as contemplated by the 14th amendment. Appellant claims absolutely no protections from the 13th and subsequent amendments, and furthermore appellant

totally and completely disclaims any contention that might arise alleging that provisions of the 13th and subsequent amendments are a basis for appellate jurisdiction in the instant appeal, or a basis of adjudication of the instant appeal.

The basis of appellate jurisdiction in the instant case is strictly according to the aforementioned provisions of the original United States Constitution (1787) and according to its Bill of Rights (1791) where applicable through the original United States Constitution and its Preamble.

As will be seen from the statement of the case appellant's citizenship is a matter of natural right, evidenced by the Preamble of the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Texas and appellant owes absolutely nothing to the 14th Amendment the privileged citizenship

it offers to those contemplated thereby. Van Valkenburg -v- Brown. 43 Cal 43. 47 (1872).

This disclaimer of the 13th and subsequent amendments is made by appellant to make clear appellant's intention to completely exclude their provisions from having any effect on this appeal, the same being absolutely and constitutionally inapplicable to appellant and the instant appeal.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Appellant asserts that, he is of the white race and a unenfranchised common law citizen of the Union as ordained and established in the Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America (1787) and as defined in Dred Scott -vs- Sandford, 19 How. 393. Appellant asserts that he is a inhabitant of the State of Texas with his permanent abode at 10922 Muscatine, Jacinto City, Texas, within the 6th Judicial District of the State of Texas and within the 5th Judicial Circuit of the Union. The Appellant, Charles W. Brown, is a layman untrained in procedural law and he request, in the interest of justice, that the Court give wide latitude to the pleadings contained herein.

The issue of the Appellants citizenship was evidenced into the trial court on the 1st day of december, 1986, and the appellant aver that, his citizenship was-

/has been declared to be of the Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America and of this state and not a class emanating from the 14th amendment. This Declaratory Judgment was filed in the 157th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Houston, Texas on the 23rd day of June, 1986 and after being duly informed the Court declared my citizenship to be as stated supra, on the 8th day of September, 1986 and therefore, the appellant has standing to raise the constitutional questions raised by the appellant and has standing to assert their protections against the usurpation of power purportedly conferred to Congress of the United States by passage of the 13th and subsequent amendment.

Neither the trial court nor the Court of Appeals (5th Cr.) made any direct ruling on the issue of standing. The trial court was prejudiced of the issues before the

court as this Court can see from the documentation filed therein. The trial court denied appellant due process as provided and mandated in the 5th and 7th Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America.

The Court of Appeals (5th Cr.), made no ruling on the issue of standing as stated supra, the appellant believes the Court of Appeals (5th Cr.) understood the issues before the court, by, the statement made in its order dismissing the appeal. The Court of Appeals said: "though the Appellant discusses serious matters, he states no legal claim for this court."

The appellant believes that by the statement made by the Court of Appeals (5th Cr.) appellant's Complaint filed in the trial court was not frivolous and should have not been dismissed as being frivolous. The appellant believes that, if something is serious it cannot be

frivolous and proves to Appellant, that, the trial court was prejudiced against the appellant.

The appellant believes that, the Court of Appeals affirmed Appellant's contentions that the trial court nor the Court of Appeals (5th Cr.) has no authority under Article III of the Constitution for the United States of America and that, they exercise only legislative power under the authority of Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 and Clause 17. Over Congresses subjects/creations made under the authority of the 13th, 14th and subsequent amendments in addition to the original Constitution (1787) for the purpose of destroying the common law state citizen as established in the Preamble to the original Constitution for the United States of America (1787) and has totally subverted the original Constitution by bringing this creation into the political

body.

WHY QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE SO SUBSTANTIAL AS TO REQUIRE PLENARY CONSIDERATION

Appellant request that this appeal be heard with briefs from the Trial Court (Judge Norman W. Black) and the Attorney for the Appellees. The Texas/federal Social Security Act/Agreement has many elements of fraud, when administered in conjunction with the appellants common law citizenship, violate diverse prohibitions of Article I, Section 10, of the Constitution for the United States of America. The Congress both state and federal being the conniver, id est, to close their eyes and pretend not to see and to be in secret understanding of this fraud. The Appellees et al are co-conspirators, by enforcing a legislative deprivation of appellant's rights in the first instance when they in fact had knowledge of the appellants rescission of the Social

Security Number based upon fraud, misrepresentation and concealment. The substantiality of this speaks for itself.

To relate how the provisions of this complex Act of administrative law has operated to the deprivation of appellant and escalated to this instant action, requires extensive discussion.

Appellant feels that for this court to properly be appraised of the prevailing conditions of both law and fact related to the instant appeal, full briefs will be imperative.

CONCLUSION

Appellant has raised serious federal constitutional issues, as they relate to the appellant and his common law citizenship.

Therefore, appellant respectfully brings this appeal, appealing to this courts good sense, not the courts prejudice's, nor the courts hatreds, but to the courts wisdom, to the courts consciences, to the courts

patriotism and the only mercy appellant ask is the mercy of an honest judgment. Appellant appeals to this court because the assertions of law and fact speak for themself, eventhough, the trial court has made light of the supreme law of the land, the law of nature and laughed at mercy and has trampled upon the holiest human ties.

Appellant request this court to docket this appeal and if necessary to the understanding of the issues of this appeal order the trial court (Norman W. Black), if this Court deems necessary, to issue an opinion as to its actions.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Brown

Charles W. Brown
6th Judicial District
10922 Muscatine
Houston, Texas
(713) 455-4709

Appellant, In Pro Per

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

CHARLES W. BROWN, Plaintiff vs BROWN & ROOT U.S.A. et al, Defendant.	CIVIL ACTION H-86-3247

ORDER

Pending before the Court Plaintiff's "ascertainment of the process of service date and order." Plaintiff has filed this action Pro se, and has been given leave of the Court to proceed in forma pauperis. He apparently filed the "ascertainment" because the United States Marshals has not perfected service upon the Defendants he named in his complaint.

Under the circumstances, the Court declines to order the Marshals to attempt further service upon the named Defendants, and, on its own motion, will dismiss this action.

The Court has discretion to dismiss a complaint that is filed in forma pauperis "if satisfied that the action is frivolous or malicious." 28 USC Sec. 1915 (d). Having reviewed Plaintiff's complaint, and the applicable law, the Court is of the opinion that Plaintiff's case is frivolous.

A pro se complaint may not be dismissed as frivolous unless it appears beyond doubt that the Plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him relief. McFadden v. Lucas, 713 F.2d 143 (5th Cir. 1983) cert. denied, 104 S. Ct. 499 (1983). In making this determination, the Court must give the complaint the liberal reading traditionally granted to pro se pleadings. Harris v. United States Department of Justice, 680 F.2d 1109 (5t Cir..(1982), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1212 (1983). Having reviewed Plaintiff's complaint and

the applicable law, the Court is of the opinion that Plaintiff can prove no set of facts that would support his claim for relief for alleged violations of the Constitution and federal racketeering statutes, 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1981 ("RICO").

"The right of self-representation is not a license to abuse the dignity of the court-room. Neither is it a license not to comply with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law." Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806, 834 n. 46 (1975). The Court admonishes Plaintiff that filing frivolous lawsuits is punishable by sanctions of fine and/or incarceration. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. The Court puts Plaintiff on notice that the Court shall sanction Plaintiff if Plaintiff files any other frivolous lawsuits. This is not to imply that Plaintiff is barred from seeking redress from the Court for legitimate grievances, but the Court will not toler-

ate further abuse of the judical system by Plaintiff. Therefore, it is Ordered that Plaintiff's action is DISMISSED as frivolous. IT IS SO ORDERED.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

CHARLES W. BROWN, Plaintiff vs BROWN & ROOT U.S.A. et al, Defendant.	CIVIL ACTION H-86-3247

FINAL JUDGMENT

The Court having found, that Plaintiff's complaint in forma pauperis is frivolous, that action is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

This ia a FINAL JUDGMENT.

Done at Houston, Texas, this 18th day of November, 1986.

Norman W. Black
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

CHARLES W. BROWN, Plaintiff vs BROWN & ROOT U.S.A. et al, Defendant.	CIVIL ACTION H-86-3247

ORDER

Plaintiff"s motion to compel and motion for amendment and relief from judgment are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Done at Houston, Texas, this 23rd day of January, 1987.

Norman W. Black
United States District Judge

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO A COURT OF
APPEALS FROM A ORDER OF
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

United States Court of Appeals for the
Fifth Circuit

CHARLES W. BROWN, Plaintiff vs BROWN & ROOT U.S.A. et al. Defendant.	CIVIL ACTION H-86-3247 NOTICE OF APPEAL PROCEEDING IN FORMA PAUPERIS AS A MATTER OF RIGHT

Notice is hereby given that Charles W. Brown, Appellant above named, hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit from an Order entered in this action on the 18th day of November, 1986, and final Judgment and order entered on the 23rd day of January, 1987.

Subscribed to this 6th day of February, 1987.

Charles W. Brown
Appellant
10418 North LaCrosse
Houston, Texas 77029

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 87-2139
SUMMARY CALENDAR

CHARLES W. BROWN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BROWN AND ROOT U.S.A. INC., ET AL.

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

---

(November 6, 1987)

Before REAVLEY, RANDALL, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Though appellant discusses serious matters, he states no legal claim for this Court. It is therefore DISMISSED. See 5th Circuit Local Rule 42.2.

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 87-2139

CHARLES W. BROWN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BROWN AND ROOT U.S.A. INC., ET AL,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

---

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING
(November 23rd, 1987)

Before REAVLEY, RANDALL, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for rehearing filed in the above entitled and numbered cause be and the same is hereby Denied

ENTERED FOR THE COURT:

REAVLEY
United States Circuit Judge

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

December Term, 1987

CHARLES W. BROWN,
"Unenfranchised Citizen of Texas"
Appellant,

VS.

BROWN AND ROOT U.S.A. INC.,
CECIL SHEPHARD, PAT BLACKBURN,
WILLIAM L BEDMAN, JAMES E. YOUNG,
JOHN AND JANE DOE'S 1 - 99
Appellees.

On Appeal from the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

NOTICE OF APPEAL

CHARLES W. BROWN
10922 Muscatine
Houston, Texas
(713) 455-4709 Appellant in Pro Per

WILLIAM L. BEDMAN
4100 Clinton Dr.
P. O. Box 3
Houston, Texas 77001
(713) 676-4355 Attorney for Appellees

Appellant hereby gives Notice of Appeal from the order entered in the case no. (87-2139) on the 6th day of November, 1987, by Circuit Judges: Reavley, Randall, and Davis in the United States Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, and order denying Petition for Rehearing on the 23rd day of November, 1987.

II

The adverse party to the appeal is Brown & Root U.S.A Inc. et al.

III

The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of attorney's are:

WILLIAM L. BEDMAN
4100 CLINTON DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001
(713) 676 4355

Attorney for Appellees

CHARLES W. BROWN
10922 MUSCATINE
HOUSTON, TEXAS
(713) 455-4709

Appellant in Pro Per

IV

I hereby certify that I served the Notice of Appeal on the 8th day of December, 1987, within the time allowed by law, by serving a true copy thereof, upon:

JUDGE: NORMAN W. BLACK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
515 RUSK AVENUE
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002

BROWN & ROOT U.S.A. INC.
4100 CLINTON DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001
(713) 676-4355

WILLIAM L. BEDMAN
4100 CLINTON DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001
(713) 676-4355

JAMES E. YOUNG
4100 CLINTON DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001
(713) 676-4355

CECIL SHEPHARD
% CHAMPION PAPER MILL
11611 FIFTH STREET
SHELDON, TEXAS, 77044

PAT BLACKBURN
% CHAMPION PAPER MILL
11611 FIFTH STREET
SHELDON, TEXAS, 77044

V

This appeal is taken by authority of Article III section 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America and 28 USC 1252 made in pursuance thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Charles W. Brown
In Propria Persona

Plaintiff-Appellant

CAUSE NO. 86 28224

CHARLES W. BROWN Petitioner,	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
VS.	OF HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
JOHN & JANE DOES NOS. 1 THROUGH 99 Respondents.	157TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ORDER FOR DECLARATION OF CITIZENSHIP

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Plaintiff Request for DECLARATION of State citizenship coming before the Court for hearing on the 23rd day of June, 1986, Plaintiff appearing specially in propria persona.

The Court having considered Petitioner's Request for Declaration on class of Citizenship, the exhibits, memorandum and affirmations submitted therewith, and arguments of Plaintiff.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the Court herby takes Notice and Declares that the Petitioner's class of Citizenship being

that of the Preamble as set out in the U.S. Constitution and in this States Constitutions Preamble and not a class emanating from or through the Fourteenth Amendment.

SO ORDERED, this 8th day of September, 1986

/S/ Felix Salazar Jr.
Presiding State District Court Judge